

Fellow Planning Commissioners; As I am unable to attend the next couple of meetings, I would like to share some thoughts that I have on the C.W.P.P. and the rezones that are pending.

First, on the C.W.P.P.'s: At 1.12.1 The wording should be looked at and consider removing the two sentences- "An urban growth..." and "In determining..." .

At 1.12.6 Section one of the CWPP deals with urban growth. I am concerned with the county removing 1.12.4 and skipping to 1.12.6 . There will be no accounting of how an amendment can be initiated, only how it will be reviewed.

At 1.12.7 we should consider removing everything after the word "document...":

At 3.5 we have no control over what the state will or will not do.

At 3.6 who is the "air port authority", and what control does the county have over them?

At 4.2 consider dropping or defining "ECONOMICALLY VIABLE"

At 10.6 consider dropping or defining " to the fullest extent possible"

Next, my thoughts on the Mineral rezone:

I have looked very thoroughly at the area in question, and I am unable to find where an error was made.

At the good of the order on 8-24-10 Mr. Vander Stoop stated that the County Code requires us to accept the application for rezone request. He is correct! And we have accepted the request for review. Code does not demand that we that we accept the change requested, <sup>ONLY</sup> that we consider it under the criteria used for this designation when an error in the original designation is evident.

Further, the fact that the land has been divided into 80 +acre tracts and some wells have been drilled is perfectly fine. That is exactly what we planned for. Further division "is not".

As to the fire commissioner or the fire chiefs concern's...we have a good road standard in place and as we all know it covers the road and drive ways. At the time of development, the concerns will be resolved.

Although the citizens of the Mineral area have valid concerns, we can not let personal feelings or monetary concerns influence our decision. We must follow G.M.A. rules and the W.A.C. as well as the L.C.C. code.

I would invite the applicants to pursue the venue of "Burchfield" if further development is desired.

Thanks for listening to me.....Bill Russell 9-9-2010

